



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

No one of the bases which have been suggested is likely to be accepted in its simplicity. Some combination of points from the most important of them may be finally adopted as a compromise. It is much easier to say what will not prove acceptable to the powers than what will receive their approval. Captain Mahan's suggestion of a limitation of the size and cost of battleships is sure to be rejected, as such a limitation, if effected, would leave the real problem untouched. General Miles' idea of one soldier to every one thousand of the population would find stout opponents, as it would leave some of the powers at such a disadvantage from the point of view of actual war. An agreement not to employ new types of arms and bullets will probably never be reached.

But, in spite of these difficulties, some workable scheme will be found by the united wisdom of the Hague Conference. The trend is now strongly in that direction, and "where there is a will there is a way." This way may possibly be found in a simple twofold agreement: first, not to increase either the armies or the navies beyond their present size; and, secondly, to fix a reduced maximum for both armies and navies,—say, at one-third or one-fifth of the size of the German army and the British navy,—to which all the armies and navies shall be reduced by the end of a period of five or ten years, the reserves of the land forces to be reduced in some similar proportion. A simple scheme of this kind, imperfect as it is, which would ultimately leave all the great powers on a practical equality, abolish the ruinous rivalry of the present time, and lift the burden of fear which oppresses the small powers, might easily furnish a real beginning of the solution of the greatest and most difficult practical problem which the nations have ever been compelled to face. If they can be induced to *begin* in a sincere and earnest way, they will soon find all reasons for vying with one another gone, and a new era, newer than any that has yet been seen, will have dawned on the world.

### Editorial Notes.

#### Limitation of Armaments.

In our last issue we referred to the speech of Mr. d'Estournelles de Constant at the London Interparliamentary Conference on the subject of limitation of armaments, but had no account of the action taken on the subject. We have since received, in French, a copy of the resolution which the Executive Council, after much deliberation, presented to the Conference, which was unanimously adopted. It was as follows:

"Whereas, The growth of naval and military expenses which weigh upon the world is universally recognized as intolerable, the Interparliamentary Conference formally expresses the wish that the question of limitation of armaments may be inscribed upon the program of the next Hague Conference.

"The Conference decides that each group forming a part of the Interparliamentary Union shall without delay communicate this resolution to the government of their country, and shall use their strongest influence over the parliament to which they belong to the end that the question of limitation of armaments may be made the subject of a national study, necessary to the success of the subsequent international study."

This action of the Interparliamentary Union, following that of the British government and House of Commons, makes it certain that the subject of limitation and reduction of armaments will be considered at the coming Hague Conference. And it will come before the Conference in such a way as to insure important results. The difficulty with the question of disarmament at the first Hague Conference, as Hon. Andrew D. White has declared, was that there had been no preliminary study of the subject, either by the Russian government, which brought it forward, or by anybody else. If the national groups of the Interparliamentary Union follow up, as they will certainly do, in their various parliaments, the instructions contained in the foregoing resolution, they will secure, in at least a considerable number of the more important parliaments, such a preliminary investigation the coming winter of the whole problem of armaments as will enable the Hague Conference to deal intelligently and effectively with the subject. There can be no turning back now. The matter has gone too far and secured too much support of the first order to admit of its being again turned down in the World's Peace Conference at The Hague.

The following passage from Wm. J. Bryan's great speech at the Interparliamentary Conference in London in July, in support of his resolution for impartial arbitration in every dispute before resort to war,—*"a peace speech, terse, rapid, epigrammatical,"* says the *Herald of Peace*,—will almost certainly hereafter be often cited as one of the great bits of American oratory:

"The first advantage of the resolution is that it secures the investigation of the facts, and if you can but separate the fact from the question of honor, the chances are a hundred to one that you will settle both the fact and the question of honor. Passion is not often roused by questions which do not affect a nation's integrity and honor. If we can but stay the hand of war until conscience has asserted itself, war will be more remote. When men are mad they swagger and talk about what they can do. When men are calm they think about what they ought to do. The second advantage is that investigation gives time for calm consideration. Man excited is a very different animal from man calm. The third advantage is that it gives an opportunity of mobilizing public opinion for the compelling of a peaceable settlement. Public opinion is a controlling force; it is going to be more and more a power in the world. One

of the greatest statesmen that any country has produced — Thomas Jefferson — once said that if he had to choose between a government without newspapers and newspapers without a government he would rather risk newspapers without a government. You may call it an extravagant statement, and yet it presents an idea, and that idea is that public opinion is a controlling force. I am glad that the time is coming when the world will realize that a war between two nations affects others besides themselves, glad that the time is coming when the world will not stand idly by while two nations settle their differences without proposing that they shall be settled by peaceful means. We are met in a famous hall, and looking down upon us from these walls are pictures which illustrate not only the glory that is to be won in war, but the horror. Over there is a picture of one of the great figures in English history (Nelson). There he is represented dying. I understand that war brings out great characteristics. I am aware that it gives opportunities for a display of great patriotism. But I venture to say there is as much inspiration in a noble life as there is in an heroic death. A life lived for the public has an influence upon the human race and upon the destiny of the world as great as any death upon the battlefield. The sixty-four years of spotless public service rendered by Mr. Gladstone will in the years to come be regarded as as rich an ornament to the history of this nation as the life of any man who has poured out his blood upon the battlefield. If we are to build a permanent peace, it must be on the foundation of the brotherhood of man. Is it too much to hope that as the years go by we shall begin to understand that the human family is but a larger family; that human sympathy will expand until this feeling of friendship and fraternity will be world-wide; that we shall feel as individuals and as members of a nation appalled at the taking of human life, and try to raise all questions to the level of settlement by reason and not by force?"

#### Who Can Stop Wars?

A writer in the *New Age* (London), discussing the question of armaments, says:

"The people, and the people alone, can stop wars, because it is only the people who lose by them. The classes gain. We shall look in vain to the classes to stop the wars which enrich and ennoble them. Pensions, titles, orders, for the classes: for the masses,

'Only jest the murder,'

and the workhouse to die in.

"To the Labor Party peace men make their appeal. War expenditure saps our strength, stops reform, by strengthening all the forces which make against reform. War prevents our minding our own business. The Labor Party has never yet thrown itself in good earnest into the breach and demanded peace. It has left questions of peace and war to be decided by those who were refusing it justice. It must leave them so no longer. It must study these questions, it must watch the development of wars — mark how the seed of them is sown by those who reckon on reaping a harvest. Let the lesson of the South African War be sufficient to show Labor that 'the interest of all peoples is peace.' The true interest of Labor is more bound up with the question of peace than we realize. War is all evils, all crimes in

one. It is the negation of law, of justice, of humanity. It is the crowning instance of exploitation. Liberty and peace go together. A just war is the greatest misfortune that can befall a country, except an unjust one. Ninety-nine wars out of a hundred are unjust, and after they are over are confessed to have been unnecessary. But by that time they have served their turn — it is NEVER the turn of Labor."

Yes, but there are classes and classes. There are classes besides the laborers, technically speaking, who gain nothing, but always lose by war. And the members of these classes are all *people* — a part of that something that we call the people — and can do — and some of them are doing — their full share toward putting a stop to war.

In an interesting communication to the Philadelphia *Public Ledger* entitled "No More 'Dreadnaughts,'" our able and unremitting co-laborer, Josiah W. Leeds, writes as follows:

"When Elihu Burritt, that man of many languages, was issuing, several years before the war, his little paper, the *Citizen of the World*, wherein were advocated compensated emancipation for the slaves, ocean penny postage and methods for conserving peace among the nations, he printed a very suggestive exhibit, showing the year's income of all the religious and benevolent societies having their annual meetings in London in the three months prior to the middle of the year 1854. It was the year of the Crimean War, a war which the most enlightened statesmen of England subsequently conceded to have been a stupendous blunder and crime. The list referred to started with the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, about \$700,000, and the British and Foreign Bible Society, a little less than that, down through seventy-five named organizations, concluding with such figures as \$8,500 for the Peace Society and \$7,000 for the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, together a million and a quarter of pounds sterling, or \$6,250,000 — not the cost of a single well-equipped battleship!

"Whoso scans such an exhibit of the manifold agencies designed for the good and the peace of mankind, and the alleviation of its moral and physical sufferings, must surely desire that every grim phantom of a 'Dreadnaught' may vanish out of sight, while renewed endeavors are extended to make use of the various alternatives of amity that are ready at hand, and which can be administered at a tithe of the cost of war, and devoid of its hatreds and bloodshed."

The twenty-third conference of the International Law Association will be held at Berlin from Monday, the 1st of October, to Friday, the 5th. The meeting will be held in the building of the Berlin Chamber of Commerce, Dorotheen Strasse, and the headquarters of the Association will be at the Grand Hotel de Rome, Unter den Linden. The invitation to the Association to go to the German capital was extended by the Juristic Society

and the Association for Comparative Jurisprudence and Political Economy of Berlin. The President of the Conference will be Dr. R. Koch, Imperial Privy Councillor and President of the Imperial Bank of Germany. Among the subjects to be considered are International Arbitration, on which papers will be presented by Dr. W. E. Darby and Sir Thomas Barclay; Neutrality, which will be discussed by Dr. Von Martitz, Professor of International Law at the University of Berlin, and Mr. Gaston de Leval, Adviser to the British Embassy at Brussels; the Exemption of Private Property at Sea, on which Mr. Justice Kennedy of the British High Court of Justice will read a paper; and Trade Routes, which will be discussed by Commandant Riondel of Nantes. In addition to these subjects, which are related to the international peace movement, other phases of international law will also be considered,—jurisdiction of territorial waters, naturalization and nationality, jurisdiction in divorce, company law, general average, railway transport of goods, etc. The Conference gives promise of being one of the most important ever held by the Association, and the city authorities of Berlin and the Juristic and other societies have spared nothing in the way of preparation for the comfort and entertainment of the foreign delegates.

**Off to the Peace Congress.** Secretary Trueblood sailed from New York on the "Prinzess Irene," on the 1st inst., to attend the Fifteenth International Peace Congress, which opens at Milan on the 15th of this month. He is accompanied by Hon. L. E. Chamberlain of Brockton, Mass., who goes to the Congress as the special representative of the Massachusetts State Board of Trade, and will also be one of the delegates of the American Peace Society. Four of the American Peace Society's delegates are already in Europe; namely, Bliss Perry, editor of the *Atlantic*, Dr. William H. Tolman of the Institute of Social Service, New York, Miss Anna B. Eckstein, head of the Newbury Street (Boston) School of Languages, and Madame Corinne Wilson of Paris. Messrs. Chamberlain and Trueblood go by Gibraltar and Naples and will land at Genoa the day before the Congress opens. After the Congress closes, they will remain in Milan for the Congress of Chambers of Commerce on the 25th and 26th, and then go by Munich and Dresden to Berlin in time for the Twenty-third Conference of the International Law Association, which opens the 1st of October. They will sail for home on the 6th of October from Rotterdam on the "New Amsterdam," and will, if all goes well, arrive in New York about the 15th of October. A number of delegates from other American organizations—how many we do not know—will also attend

the Milan Congress, which gives promise of being a most important gathering. On account of the Secretary's absence, the October *ADVOCATE OF PEACE* will probably be combined with the November paper in a double number. This will contain extended accounts of the Peace Congress and the Conference of the International Law Association.

### Brevities.

. . . The government of Greece has proposed that the questions in dispute between that country and Roumania be submitted to the Hague Tribunal.

. . . The work of dismantling the fortifications in the neutral zone between Norway and Sweden, the completion of which was fixed by the Karlstad Convention for the 22d of June, has been completed. That is a very big bit of news, though not much public attention has been paid to it.

. . . In his speech at the dinner given to the German editors in the Whitehall rooms, June 21, by the Anglo-German Friendship Committee, Dr. Theodor Barth of Berlin said: "All nations are better than their reputations. Misunderstanding is the mother of suspicion, and a chief reason of international quarrel. The mutual visits of representative Englishmen in Germany and representative Germans in England will, I hope, limit more and more the region of misunderstanding. We will not make ourselves blind to the real differences of national interests, but let us get rid of the inveterate error, that what one nation gains is a loss for the other, that what one nation earns in commerce and industry on the world's market means a damage for all the others. A competitor is not an enemy."

. . . Preceding the Interparliamentary Conference in London, an important meeting of representatives of the three Scandinavian Interparliamentary groups was held at Copenhagen on the 16th and 17th of July. The purpose of the meeting was to promote closer relations among the three Scandinavian groups, and to examine the question of the common attitude on international affairs which should be taken by the Scandinavian Representatives in the Interparliamentary Conferences. A resolution was adopted inviting the groups of the three kingdoms to hold a Scandinavian Interparliamentary Conference in 1907.

. . . The peace and arbitration societies of Great Britain, of which there are several strong and active ones, have formed a National Council of Peace Societies, somewhat after the type of the Permanent Commission of the French peace societies. The purpose of the Council "is to effect a closer union of the societies, and to assist them in a sincere and earnest promotion of the world's peace." Eight societies have representatives in the Council, and the constitution provides for the admission of others.

. . . Sir Wilfred Lawson, whose death recently occurred in England, was, says *Concord*, "one of the staunchest friends of the peace movement in this or any other country." No man in public life probably ever stood more fully and constantly for all the things which make a nation righteous, strong and great than Sir Wilfred.